From: Curry, Tim
To: Hudson, Scott
Subject: RE: ASPECT
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:20:00 PM

Best answers I have are as follows;

1 - We can add up to $75,000 before we hit the capacity of the extension.
2- Contracts will have to answer but my understanding is that in a JOFOC extension it is difficult to increase the capacity.
3- If we stay at ITC another week we will have about $50,000 of capacity on which to conduct a new response.
4- At the current usage and burn rate the plane could be left at ITC for approximately two weeks before we will be about out of capacity for additional responses.
5- We could extend the time at ITC by cutting out the daily flights to about three weeks before we would be about out of capacity.
6- Sending it back to Dallas now ends charging to the ITC site and leaves us about $100,000 in actual funding plus capacity to conduct any other emergency responses. A response to Houston from Dallas takes about 2.5 hours of mobilization and 2.5 demobilization with about 0.5 hours of actual data acquisition at the scene. The cost of a flight to Houston from Dallas if needed would be roughly $15,000 in that scenario. We could go to Houston any day they actually have a need if they are willing to accept the response time will go from about 1 hour to about 2.5 hours.

These estimates are not exact. I do not have any invoices for the ITC response to review yet. These are back of the envelop calculations made on the information I have at hand.

From: Hudson, Scott
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 10:02 AM
To: Curry, Tim <Curry.Timothy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: ASPECT
Importance: High

Hi Tim:

We're trying to make an informed decision about how long ASPECT can stay on-station.

Can you please attempt to answer Gina's 6 questions, below. Ballpark estimates are fine, thanks.

Scott

From: Perovich, Gina
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 10:19 AM
To: Hudson, Scott <Hudson.Scott@epa.gov>
Subject: ASPECT
Importance: High

Hi Scott -

I had some conversations with Ronnie in R6 about whether to keep ASPECT on site.
He would prefer to, and his demob plan called to, release ASPECT only after the tanks are secure and all product has been removed.
I understand that, because of the intense and constant use of the asset, we are nearing our contract ceiling for flight operations, and I have communicated that to Ronnie.
Also - while they want to keep in on-site - it is more of a "just-in-case" call, rather than an emergency need at this point.

Neither Ronnie nor I want to end up in a position where we continue to keep ASPECT flying (or sitting at Ellington) IF it will result in being unable to deploy the plane again before May 31st for another emergency. I know that we are not meeting with contracts until next week. In order to make sure we are making the right calls, I'll need to better understand the following, please:

1. How much capacity do we have left?
2. Do we have an idea or a feel for what contracts will be able to do for us regarding the ceiling? Is there likely to be a way around this and have it not be a problem? If so, perhaps leaving it on-site is not an issue?
3. If we are certain we have an issue and we need a decision ASAP….what happens if we continue with our current posture, and stay at Ellington for another week? How much capacity will that burn and how much will it leave?
4. When will we be at the point where using it here means we can no longer use it for the next 6 weeks?
5. What if we stay at Ellington, but don't fly (unless it's an emergency)? As in, we maintain our normal Addison posture, but stay closer?
6. What if we go back to Addison completely? What does that do to the above scenarios? Worth it? Or have we burned so much already that it doesn't matter?

Ronnie's first preference is to keep it on-site, but he doesn't want to do that if it takes ASPECT off the table for future use.
He can send it back to Addison after today's ops and put it back on our normal stand-by posture - but he needs to know that sooner rather than later.

Got some recommendations?

Gina Perovich
Director, Consequence Management Advisory Division
USEPA/OLEM/OEM/CMAD
202-564-2935

From: Curry, Tim
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 7:47 AM
To: Adams, Adam <Adams.Adam@epa.gov>; Crossland, Ronnie <Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov>; Rauscher, Jon <Rauscher.Jon@epa.gov>; Turner, Philip <Turner.Philip@epa.gov>; Fisher, Kelsey <fisher.kelsey@epa.gov>; Patel, Anish <patel.anish@epa.gov>; Rouse, Philip <rouse.philip@epa.gov>; Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>; Petersen, Chris <petersen.chris@epa.gov>; David Cook <david.cook@westonsolutions.com>; Janine.Latham@WestonSolutions.com; b.latham@westonsolutions.com; Loesel, Matthew <loesel.matthew@epa.gov>; Daniel Tighe <Daniel.Tighe@WestonSolutions.com>; Delgado, Eric <Delgado.Eric@epa.gov>; robert.kroutil@kalmancoinc.com; Cardarelli, John <Cardarelli.John@epa.gov>; Turville, Rick <Rick.Turville@kalmancoinc.com>; Martin, John <martin.john@epa.gov>
Cc: Hudson, Scott <Hudson.Scott@epa.gov>; Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>
Subject: ASPECT Update 1 -- 12 April 2019

Team,

The ceilings over the ITC site are above 5000 ft. A data acquisition flight targeting the tank farm, the downwind areas and the confluence/harbor is planned for approximately 09:00 a.m. There is no draft report to review from yesterday. If you have any comments or requests please contact me by my cell phone number.

Timothy Curry, PE
EPA OLEM/OEM/CMAD/FOB
11201 Renner Blvd.
Lenexa, Ks. 66219
Office Phone (913)551-5129
Cell Phone (816)718-4281